REMARKS

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fellows. Claims 3 to 5 and 7 to 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Fellows in view of Kay. Claim 6 was objected to but has been indicated as allowable.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested based on the following comments.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fellows.

Fellows shows a supply line 16 for supplying compressed air. A union 16e connects the supply line 16 to an air supply device via exterior threading. A "union" by definition is a joint uniting two pieces, in this case two air supply lines. The entire purpose of a union is to connect two pieces, and thus to provide an unrestricted connection between the two pieces.

Claim 1 recites: "the supply line having at least one **flow restrictor** altering fluid flow as a function of the at least one hole being covered by an axially-removable printing sleeve."

A union by definition is not a flow restrictor, as the purpose of the union 16e in Fellows clearly is to provide unrestricted flow between a source of compressed air and line 16.

Also, there is absolutely no indication or teaching that the fluid flow through union 16e in Fellows is altered by the function of the hole being covered by a printing sleeve. In fact, Fellows provides special plugs 10e, which are sequentially removed as the sleeve is fit over the cylinder. See Fellows at col. 3, lines 21 to 49. The flow through union 16e is thus not a function of the hole being covered by the sleeve, because all holes in Fellows appear to be covered, either by the plugs or the sleeve, at all times as the sleeve is placed over the cylinder.

Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection to claim 1 and its dependent claim 2 is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 3 to 5 and 7 to 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Fellows in view of Kay.

Fellows is discussed above.

Kay discloses a multi-tube flow restrictor having two operational possibilities: either no flow at all, or a restricted flow between inlet 16 and outlet 18 which aids in sound suppression. See column 3, lines 13 to 21 and column 4, lines 20 to 31 of Kay. Kay must *move* the valve member 36 to shut off flow.

Present claim 1 recites: "the supply line having at least one flow restrictor altering fluid flow as a function of the at least one hole being covered by an axially-removable printing sleeve."

First of all, there is no desire or motivation to replace the union 16e of Fellows with a flow restrictor, as the union 16e aims to prevent flow restriction.

Even if the restrictor of Kay were somehow combinable in the Fellows device (and there is no motivation or reason to do so, as the union of Fellows does not appear to create any sound issues, or pose any other problems requiring substation of the Kay device), the claimed limitation of claim 1 would not be met. There is no teaching or indication that flow through the Kay device would be restricted as a function of any positioning of a sleeve over the first holes of Fellows, as the Kay device restricts flow as a function of the intentional movement of the valve member 36 and there is no indication that the covering of the holes in Fellows would alter any fluid flow in Kay at all, especially given the special plugs of Fellows.

Withdrawal of the rejection to dependent claims 3 to 5 and 7 to 10 which depend from claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claim 11 and 15 also recite a flow restrictor as in claim 1, and for the same reasons are submitted as patentable.

Claim 16 recites a method for axially removing a printing sleeve over a printing cylinder comprising the steps of:

> applying fluid pressure to an inside of a printing sleeve located on a printing cylinder through holes at a work side end of the printing cylinder and

through other holes between the holes at the work side end and a gear side end of the printing cylinder;

sliding the printing sleeve in a direction of the work side end of the printing cylinder; and

automatically restricting flow through the other holes when the printing sleeve no longer is located over the other holes.

Fellows clearly does not automatically restrict flow through the other holes when the printing sleeve is no longer located over the other holes, since special plugs 10e are provided which must be manually placed over the holes. There is absolutely no teaching or motivation in the Kay reference to do away with these plugs or substitute a resitrctor for the union 16e of Fellows, which union 16e is designed to provide free flow of air, and not to restrict air.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 to claims 11, 15 and 16 and to their dependent claims, as well as to the claims which depend from claim 1, is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and applicants respectfully request such action.

If any additional fees are deemed to be due at this time, the Assistant Commissioner is authorized to charge payment of the same to Deposit Account No. 50-0552.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By

William C. Gehris
Reg. No. 38,156

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC
485 Seventh Avenue, 14th Floor
New York, New York 10018
(212) 736 - 1940